17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendants.

1		
2		
3		*E-filed 2/9/06*
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
11	ELIZABETH TREVINO and YADIRA RIOS, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly	Case No. C05-00239 JF (HRL)
12	situated,	
13	Plaintiffs,	INTERIM ORDER RE: DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF DISCOVERY ORDER
14	V.	21500 (2101 010 220
15	ACB AMERICAN, INC., HILCO	
16	RECEIVABLES, LLC, B. MASTERS and K. FRANCIS,	

On February 6, 2006, defendants filed two documents with the court: (1) "Defendants' Objections to Magistrate's January 27, 2006 Order . . . and Motion for De Novo Determination and Motion for Expansion of the Record," and (2) "Defendants' Request for Clarification as to Order Re: Motions to Compel or in the Alternative, Request for Permission to File Motion for Reconsideration." The court understands these filings represent defendants' (1) request to this court to "clarify" its January 27, 2006 discovery order, andm, (2) in the alternative, objections to that order addressed to the trial court.

Specifically, defendants request clarification on three issues: (1) the intended temporal scope for the court's order that defendants provide information related to prior claims, litigation, and attorney demand letters; (2) whether the court's ruling with respect to Hilco Interrogatory no. 24 should be changed in light of the fact that the court may have misunderstood defendants'

## Case 5:05-cv-00239-JF Document 57 Filed 02/09/06 Page 2 of 3

representations about not having commenced litigation or arbitration against California debtors
during the relevant time period; and (3) whether footnote 9 of the order constitutes a "factual
determination," and if so, whether that factual determination is proper.

This court is willing to consider amending the January 27, 2006 order as to these three issues upon further briefing by both parties. Accordingly, plaintiffs shall file an opposition or response to defendants' request no later than February 13, 2006. Defendants may file a reply no later than February 15, 2006. The matter will be deemed submitted on the papers unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2/9/06	/s/ Howard R. Lloyd
	HOWARD R. LLOYD
	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

28

## 1 THIS SHALL CERTIFY THAT A COPY OF THIS ORDER WILL BE SENT TO: 2 Brian Lewis Bromberg brian@brianbromberg.com 3 Jeanine K. Clasen jclasen@mpbf.com, npruitt@mpbf.com, jmueller@mpbf.com June D. Coleman jcoleman@mpbf.com, fwilson@mpbf.com 4 Mark Ewell Ellis mellis@mpbf.com, lmiller@mpbf.com 5 Allison Amy Krumhorn allison@caclawyers.com 6 lar@caclawyers.com Lance A. Raphael 7 ronaldwilcox@post.harvard.edu Ronald Wilcox 8 \* Counsel are responsible for providing copies of this order to co-counsel. 9 10 Dated: 2/9/06 /s/ RNR 11 Chambers of Magistrate Judge Lloyd 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27